

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

HAEDYN-KHRIS RAQUEL
BEAUMANN,

Plaintiff,

v.

OFFICER BAYLESS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C20-1782-LK-SKV

ORDER GRANTING IN PART
PLAINTIFF'S SECOND REQUEST
FOR AN EXTENSION

This matter comes before the Court on a motion filed by Plaintiff Haedyn-Khris Beaumann for an extension of the deadline to file objections to the Report and Recommendation ("R&R") issued by Magistrate Judge Kate Vaughan. Dkt. No. 38. This is Beaumann's second request for an extension. The Court granted her first request and allowed her an additional month to file her objections. Dkt. No. 37. Currently, objections were due on March 23, 2022. Defendants have not responded to the motion; the Court construes the lack of a response as an admission that the motion has merit. LCR 7(b)(2).

1 Beaumann seeks an extension until an unspecified date in July 2022 to file her objections.
2 She states that she is still trying to recover from COVID-19 and food poisoning that “turned into
3 a viral infection,” necessitating hospitalization for two days in February 2022. Dkt. No. 38 at 1.
4 Beaumann states that defense counsel told her that Defendants would agree to another one-month
5 extension, but an extension of that duration is insufficient because her objections would be due at
6 the same time as her sentencing in her criminal case. *Id.* at 2. Beaumann seeks to have sufficient
7 time to focus on preparing for the sentencing. *Id.* She also anticipates being transferred to a
8 different facility after her sentencing, at which point she will be placed in quarantine and receiving
9 “for at least a month.” *Id.* She claims she has been told that she will not have access to a law library
10 during that time. *Id.*

11 Beaumann has demonstrated good cause for an extension based on her health issues.
12 However, she has not demonstrated good cause to extend the deadline for her objections to July
13 2022, which would constitute a five-month extension from the February 1, 2022 date the R&R
14 was filed. Dkt. No. 35. Even accounting for the time Beaumann claims she will not have access to
15 a law library or otherwise be able to dedicate time to this case, she will have had well over 14 days
16 to prepare her response by June 9, 2022. Furthermore, Defendants have an interest in the
17 expeditious resolution of this matter.

18 For those reasons, Beaumann’s motion for an extension, Dkt. No. 38, is GRANTED IN
19 PART and DENIED IN PART. Objections to the R&R, if any, must be filed by June 9, 2022.
20 Beaumann is reminded that failure to file objections within the specified time may affect her right
21 to appeal. Objections should be noted for consideration on the motions calendar for the third Friday
22 after they are filed. Responses to objections may be filed within fourteen (14) days after service of
23 objections. If no timely objections are filed, the matter will be ready for the Court’s consideration
24 on June 10, 2022. No further extensions will be granted absent good cause.

1 The Clerk is directed to send uncertified copies of this Order to all counsel of record and
2 to any party appearing pro se at said party's last known address, and to renote the R&R for June
3 10, 2022.

4 Dated this 24th day of March, 2022.

5 

6 Lauren King
7 United States District Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24